

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
9 **FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
10

11 REGINALD EDWARD SPEARMAN,

12 Plaintiff,

13 v.

14 SAM BERRI TOWING, et al.,

15 Defendants.
16

No. 2:21-CV-1214-WBS-DMC-P

ORDER

17 Plaintiff, a prisoner proceeding pro se, brings this civil rights action under 42
18 U.S.C. § 1983.

19 On September 8, 2021, the Court issued findings and recommendations that this
20 action be dismissed for failure to state a claim. See ECF No. 9. The Court stated:

21 Plaintiff names Sam Berri Towing and a number of
22 individuals as defendants. None are government employees or agencies.
23 Plaintiff alleges that Defendants stole his 1993 Nissan and then tried to
24 sell it online. Plaintiff also claims Defendants stole his grandfather's file,
25 account information, and real estate portfolio.

26 Plaintiff's complaint suffers two critical defects. First, it
27 fails to name an individual acting under color of state law. Second, it fails
28 to allege a violation of a constitutional or federal statutory right, instead
alleging only a state law tort claim for defamation. To state a claim under
§ 1983 Plaintiff must "plead that (1) the defendants acting under color of
state law (2) deprived plaintiffs of rights secured by the Constitution or
federal statutes." Gibson v. United States, 781 F.2d 1334, 1338 (9th Cir.
1986); see also Pistor v. Garcia, 791 F. 3d 1104, 1114 (9th Cir. 2015);
Long v. Cty. of Los Angeles, 442 F.3d 1178, 1185 (9th Cir. 2006); WMX
Techs., Inc. v. Miller, 197 F.3d 367, 372 (9th Cir. 1999) (en banc); Ortez

1 v. Wash. Cty., Or., 88 F.3d 804, 810 (9th Cir. 1996). Here, Plaintiff does
2 neither.

3 Because it does not appear possible that the deficiencies
4 identified herein can be cured by amending the complaint, Plaintiff is not
5 entitled to leave to amend prior to dismissal of the entire action. See
6 Lopez v. Smith, 203 F.3d 1122, 1126, 1131 (9th Cir. 2000) (en banc).

7 ECF No .9, pg. 2.

8 In his objections to the Court's findings and recommendations, Plaintiff now
9 alleges that Sam Berri Towing is the contracted towing company for the California Highway
10 Patrol (CHP) and that CHP officers conspired with Sam Berri Towing and other named
11 defendants to steal his car. See ECF No. 10. According to Plaintiff, the conspiracy renders Sam
12 Berri Towing and the other defendants state actors for purposes of § 1983. See id. Because
13 Plaintiff is correct that private actors who conspire with state officials may be acting under color
14 of state law, see Tower v. Glover, 467 U.S. 914, 920 (1984), the Court will vacate the findings
15 and recommendations and re-address Plaintiff's complaint in light of the allegations set forth in
16 Plaintiff's objections. The sufficiency of Plaintiff's complaint is addressed separately.

17 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the September 8, 2021, findings and
18 recommendations are vacated.

19 Dated: September 29, 2021



20 DENNIS M. COTA
21 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
22
23
24
25
26
27
28